

Document Log Item

Addressing	
From	To
James Chang/R9/USEPA/US	"Mabey, Bill" <BMabey@TechLawInc.com> "Mabey, Bill" <BMabey@TechLawInc.com>
CC	BCC
"Balkissoon, Indira" <IBalkissoon@TechLawInc.com> "Snow, Mary" <msnow@TechLawInc.com>	
Description Form Used: Reply	
Subject	Date/Time
RE: George OU4 FS	01/08/2008 06:34 AM
# of Attachments	Total Bytes
0	7,251
NPM	Contributor
Processing	
Comments	

Body

Document Body

Thanks Bill, and I agree with your assessment on bldg. 513. However, my attorney and risk assessor will most likely still require an IC against residential use.

James Chang
Phone: 415.972.3193 Fax: 415.947.3526

"Mabey, Bill" <BMabey@TechLawInc.com>

"Mabey, Bill" <BMabey@TechLawInc.com>

01/03/2008 03:25 PM

To "Snow, Mary" <msnow@TechLawInc.com>, James Chang/
R9/USEPA/US@EPA
cc "Balkissoon, Indira" <IBalkissoon@TechLawInc.com>
Subject: RE: George OU4 FS

James,

A point of clarification on Specific Comment 4 regarding the Building 513 Chlordane Soil Contamination: The initial investigation showed a 24,000 ug/kg chlordane concentration in soil. A repeat sampling found approx 3,000 ug/kg in the area, but did not find the higher concentration. At a subsequent BCT it was agreed that further investigation of this small area was not warranted; since the location was just outside the building where equipment washout activities could have occurred I think the 24,000 number could be real, but the Air Force

says the 24,000 number was not confirmed. The area is small and the BCT

agreed that remediation was not necessary. In SC 19 we do ask that the AF recognize the value above the residential PRG of 1,600 ug/kg.

Because the Building is schedule for demolition, the hassle of defining

an IC may not be worthwhile for this FFS and the followup ROD. Let us know if you want these comments revised.

Bill

-----Original Message-----

From: Snow, Mary

Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2008 8:30 AM

To: Snow, Mary; 'Chang.James@epamail.epa.gov'

Cc: Mabey, Bill; Balkissoon, Indira

Subject: RE: George OU4 FS

Please forgive me. It is attached this time!

-Mary

-----Original Message-----

From: Snow, Mary
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 4:45 PM
To: 'Chang.James@epamail.epa.gov'
Cc: Mabey, Bill; Balkissoon, Indira
Subject: RE: George OU4 FS

Happy New Year James,
Attached you will find our review of the FFS for OU 4. Please feel free to call Bill or me if you have any questions or would like to discuss it further.
Thanks, Mary

-----Original Message-----

From: Chang.James@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Chang.James@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 06, 2007 6:48 AM
To: Mabey, Bill; Balkissoon, Indira; Snow, Mary
Cc: Commisso.Angela@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: George OU4 FS

Mary/Bill,
Please conduct a detailed review of subject FS and give me your inputs by Dec 26. Since all required removals have been done, and some sites require ICs, focus your review for following areas:
- The discussion of remedies and determine if they adequately support the remedial action objectives.
- If FS supports the CERCLA process.
- If FS is adequate documentation for the ROD.
Let me know a week in advance of Dec 26 you're going to have problems meeting that due date. Thanks.

(See attached file: Draft OU 4 FFS.pdf)

James Chang
Phone: 415.972.3193 Fax: 415.947.3526

